



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,911	09/22/2003	Elliot N. Linzer	03-1089 1496.00325	9918
24319 7590 02/23/2007 LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 MILPITAS, CA 95035			EXAMINER DESIR, JEAN WICEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/667,911

Applicant(s)

LINZER, ELLIOT N.

Examiner

Jean W. Désir

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Demos (US 5,988,863).

#### **Claim 1:**

Demos clearly disclosed:

An apparatus (see *Fig. 10*) comprising:

“a first circuit configured to receive an encoded video signal at a first input and to present a decoded video signal at a first output”, see *item 100 of Fig. 10 which constitutes a first circuit as claimed;*

“and a second circuit (*items 102, 104, 106 of Fig. 10 constitute a second circuit as claimed*) configured to receive said decoded video signal at a second input and to present (i) a first video output signal (*output: 1k x 512 pixels resolution at 72 Hz*) having a first resolution at a second output and (ii) a second video output signal (*output: 2k x 1k*)

*pixels resolution at 72 Hz*) having a second resolution at a third output, wherein said first video output signal and said second video output signal are generated in response to said decoded video signal (*item 100 of Fig. 10*)”.

Claim 2:

“a decoder circuit configured to generate said decoded video signal in response to said encoded video signal” is disclosed, see item 100 Fig. 10;

“and a memory circuit configured to store said decoded video signal” is disclosed, see col. 9 lines 26-27.

Claim 3 is disclosed, see col. 11 lines 32-37, col. 14 lines 32-35.

Claim 4 is met: by item 102 which constitutes a first video generating circuit as claimed, and by items 104, 106 which constitute a second video generating circuit as claimed.

Claim 5 is disclosed, the first video output signal (*1k x 512 pixels resolution at 72 Hz*) and the second video output signal (*2k x 1k pixels resolution at 72 Hz*) have different scales as claimed.

Claims 6-8 are disclosed, see col. 19 lines 28-39, col. 14 lines 32-39.

Claims 9, 10 are disclosed, see col. 19 lines 40-49, col. 14 lines 28-39.

Claim 11 is disclosed, see col. 14 lines 35-39, col. 1 line 53.

Claim 12 is disclosed, see col. 15 lines 15-36.

**Claim 13** is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

**Claim 14** is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chiang et al (US 6,553,072).

**Claim 1:**

Chiang clearly disclosed:

An apparatus (*see Fig. 9 item 107*) comprising:

"a first circuit configured to receive an encoded video signal at a first input and to present a decoded video signal at a first output", *see item 150 of Fig. 9 which constitutes a first circuit as claimed;*

"and a second circuit (*items 180, 170, 175 of Fig. 9 constitute a second circuit as claimed*) configured to receive said decoded video signal at a second input and to present (i) a first video output signal (*output of item 180*) having a first resolution (*HDTV*) at a second output and (ii) a second video output signal (*output of item 175*) having a second resolution (*SDTV*) at a third output, wherein said first video output signal and said second video output signal are generated in response to said decoded video signal (*item 150*)".

Claim 2 is met by item 150.

Claim 5 is met, because HDTV and SDTV have different scales as claimed.

Claim 11 is met, because of outputs HDTV and SDTV.

**Claim 13** is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

**Claim 14** is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demos (US 5,988,863).

Claim 16:

Demos generates first and second intermediate signals as claimed and as already pointed out in the rejection of claim 3 (see col. 11 lines 32-37, col. 14 lines 32-35), except Demos does not explicitly say these signals are generated simultaneously; however, providing signals simultaneously is a notoriously well known technique in the art used in order to make them available concurrently for further processing and/or to make them available to users concurrently; thus an artisan would be motivated to modify Demos and implement this existing technique in order to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 17 is disclosed, see col. 15 lines 15-36.

Claims 18, 19 are disclosed, see col. 11 lines 32-37, col. 14 lines 32-35

Claims 20-22 are disclosed, see col. 19 lines 28-39, col. 14 lines 32-39.

Claims 23, 24 are disclosed, see col. 19 lines 40-49, col. 14 lines 28-39.

Art Unit: 2622

Claim 25 is obvious in view of Demos, see col. 14 lines 35-39, col. 1 line 53, and signals that are presented simultaneously is already addressed in the rejection of claim 16.

6. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang et al (US 6,553,072).

Chiang generates video signals that comprise standard definition (SD) and high definition (HD) video signals as claimed, except Chiang does not explicitly say these signals are presented simultaneously; however, providing signals simultaneously is a notoriously well known technique in the art used in order to make them available concurrently for further processing and/or to make them available to users concurrently; thus an artisan would be motivated to modify Chiang and implement this existing technique in order to arrive at the claimed invention. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to Dujmenovic reference have been fully considered and are persuasive because Dujmenovic does not teach a second output and a third output as argued by the Applicant. Therefore, the final rejection mailed on 8/25/06 is withdrawn, a new final rejection is presented above to the Applicant.

### **Conclusion**

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (571) 272 7344. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272 7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**JWD**

**Feb. 18, 07**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lin Ye', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

**LIN YE**  
**PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER**